

Subject: RE: Moving on: Failed States

[Reply](#) [Quote](#) [Set Flag](#)

Author: Kevin GALALAE

[◀ Previous Post](#) | [Next Post ▶](#)

Posted date: Wednesday, November 18, 2009 1:00:21 PM
GMT

Last modified date: Wednesday, November 18, 2009 1:00:21
PM GMT

Total views: 23 **Your views:** 3

[Hide Parent Post](#)

Author: N. Wright

Date: Tuesday, November 17, 2009 7:13:02 PM GMT

Subject: Moving on: Failed States

Dear All,

Thanks for your various - and varied - contributions. You've all put some good postings up which I hope has provided food for thought.

We still have a fair amount of discussion time available for this week, so I would like, if I may, to move our attention on to the question of **failed states**.

The pop quiz for this week asks simply what a failed state is and we frequently hear reference to these with Somalia being perhaps the most common example. However, as well as considering that, I would like you to offer some thoughts on **how we deal with them**.

1. We have the technical, logistical and material capacity to "help" failed states - but is there a **duty** to do so? If so, how does this manifest itself? Is this something that can be sanctioned only by the UN and then carried out under its auspices?
2. Do other bordering states have the right to intervene if they feel that a failing state may well have a serious impact on their own territorial integrity - a potential example that springs to mind is that of North Korea and the impact its collapse might have on China; you can also see this on the eastern borders of Europe where states such as Moldova have faced huge difficulties in recent years.
3. A final question is, what happens if a state is allowed to fail - perhaps a little philosophical, but can a state cease to exist, and what might take its place? Much of the post cold war era has been about the birth of new states. But if a state lacks the wherewithal to function, how do we manage that? The implications are a commitment that would run to decades to rebuild such an entity - and if we can't guarantee to stay there to see the job done, should we just avoid involvement in the first place?

As ever, I look forward to hearing what you come up with!

Best wishes,

Nick

Nick,

With all due respect, I believe this constitutes an act of censorship.

Kevin

Subject: RE: Moving on: Failed States

Subject: RE: Moving on: Failed States

[Reply](#) [Quote](#) [Set Flag](#)

Author: [N. Wright](#)

Posted date: Wednesday, November 18, 2009 1:30:08 PM GMT

Last modified date: Wednesday, November 18, 2009 1:32:09 PM GMT

Total views: 26 **Your views:** 5

[< Previous Post](#) | [Next Post >](#)

[Hide Parent Post](#)

Author: Kevin GALALAE

Date: Wednesday, November 18, 2009 1:00:21 PM GMT

Subject: RE: Moving on: Failed States

Nick,

With all due respect, I believe this constitutes an act of censorship.

Kevin

Dear Kevin,

I am not entirely clear on what exactly is being censored here.

There has been a pretty comprehensive discussion of various aspects of the War on Terrorism. However one we have yet to address is failed states which is included on the list of points recommended for consideration this week (please see the guidance for week 8).

As students are perfectly able to continue the discussion of the previous points should they wish, that does not seem to constitute censorship to me.

Best wishes,

Nick

Subject: RE: Moving on: Failed States

Subject: RE: Moving on: Failed States

[Reply](#) [Quote](#) [Set Flag](#)

Author: Kevin GALALAE

Posted date: Wednesday, November 18, 2009 3:02:01 PM GMT

Last modified date: Wednesday, November 18, 2009 3:02:01 PM GMT

Total views: 26 **Your views:** 4

[< Previous Post](#) | [Next Post >](#)

[Hide Parent Post](#)

Author: N. Wright

Date: Wednesday, November 18, 2009 1:32:09 PM GMT

Subject: RE: Moving on: Failed States

Dear Kevin,

I am not entirely clear on what exactly is being censored here.

There has been a pretty comprehensive discussion of various aspects of the War on Terrorism. However one we have yet to address is failed states which is included on the list of points recommended for consideration this week (please see the guidance for week 8).

As students are perfectly able to continue the discussion of the previous points should they wish, that does not seem to constitute censorship to me.

Best wishes,

Nick

Hi Nick,

This week's topic is Al-Qaeda and terrorism and the guiding questions are:

1. Has the challenge posed by al-Qaeda peaked?
2. Is it possible to win the 'war on terror'? What would victory look like?
3. How far are al-Qaeda's demands essentially political and how far essentially religious?

We have never before discussed the pop quiz questions in a forum. Changing the subject just two days into the debate and at a time when you no longer agree with the opinions aired seems highly suspicious to me. I remind you that a university is an environment where freedom of speech and academic freedom are supposed to thrive and not be subverted by overt or covert censorship.

This is my opinion on the subject and unless we return to the topic we were discussing I for one am withdrawing my participation in the forums. I wish to also state that it is this very kind of treatment that has Muslims of all colours up in arms against the West and seething with anger at the methods of control that are being imposed on them by the Anglo-American coalition. Furthermore, manipulating the dialogue in this fashion and at a time when dialogue is the only method of forging international consensus and maintaining global peace is a recipe for disaster and a reflex that I would have hoped Britain has abandoned when it lost its colonies. Its presence in the context of a university and in an international relations program is most unbecoming.

In conclusion, I wish to state that I am not attempting to influence any of my fellow students and that I hope each and every one of them will make their own decision.

I wish all my colleagues a successful completion of the course.

Warm regards,

Kevin

Subject: RE: Moving on: Failed States